

### SUPPORT FOR AMENDMENTS

The claims have been amended for clarity. Support can be found in the claims as originally filed. Claims 12-20 have been newly added. Support for the amendments and the newly added claims can be found in the specification:

- Claim 7: page 3, line 29 through page 4, line 1;
- Claim 8: page 27, lines 10-15;
- Claims 9-11: page 18, line 4 through page 20, line 3;
- Claim 12: page 5, lines 14-16;
- Claim 13: page 4, line 21 through page 5, line 6;
- Claim 14: page 7, lines 11-13;
- Claim 15: page 6, line 1 through page 7, line 1;
- Claim 16: page 8, lines 21-23;
- Claim 17: page 7, line 28 through page 8, line 19;
- Claim 18: page 8, lines 29-30;
- Claim 19: page 10, lines 24-27; and
- Claim 20: page 9, line 23 through page 10, line 15.

No new matter has been added.

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

On the outset, Applicants thank Examiner Harlan for indicating that Claims 1 and 2 are allowable. Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable in view of the amendments. Furthermore, Applicants thank Examiner Harlan for the telephone discussion of March 9, 2009. The Examiner agreed to issue a Supplemental Office Action to address the objection to Claim 7 on the record.

The rejection of Claims 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> ¶, has been obviated by amendment. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has objected to Claim 7 and stated: "Claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." Applicants note that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, was applied to Claims 3-6 for containing language that included the word "type." This language does not appear in Claim 7. Furthermore, Claim 7 is dependent on Claim 1, which the Examiner indicated as allowable. Accordingly, the objection is rendered moot. However, Applicants note that Claim 7 has been amended for clarity and support is listed above.


**Request for Rejoinder**

MPEP § 821.04 states: "In order to be eligible for rejoinder, a claim to a nonelected invention must depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable claim." Applicants note that withdrawn Claims 8-11 depend from *and* contain all the limitations of Claim 1, which the Examiner has indicated as allowable. Rejoinder is therefore appropriate and Applicants respectfully request rejoinder of Claims 8-11.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Notification thereof is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

  
Benjamin A. Vastine, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 64,422

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413-2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)